

REMARKS**Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Plotnick et al (US 2005/0097599 A1).

In response to the rejection, the applicant has amended Claim 1 by limiting it further, and deleted Claim 10. The rejection to Claim 10 is now moot.

Claim 1

Claim 1 of the present invention reads as follows (emphasis is added);

1. (Currently amended) A real-time service system using an interactive data communication, the system comprising:

a plurality of digital set-top boxes of users for replaying service contents selected by the user in real time through a television by being supplied through a telephone line of a very high-data rate digital subscriber line (VDSL), wherein the service contents comprise audio/image signals from the telephone line, wherein the audio/image signals are transmitted to an MPEG data storing block, and wherein the plurality of digital set-top boxes of users further comprise an audio/image switching block for replaying through the television the service contents received from the MPEG data storing block and selected by the users;

a number of system operating device installed by a predetermined region unit and connected to the plurality of digital set-top boxes of the users in a corresponding region via a telephone line of the VDSL for supplying the service contents

required at a corresponding set-top box in real time by the interactive data communication with an arbitrary digital set-top box; and

a service providing device for storing various service contents received from a contents providing device and for supplying the corresponding service contents to a corresponding system operating device in real time in response to a service content request from the system operating device inputted through the Internet.

The amended Claim 1 of the present invention is directed to a real time service system using the interactive data communication and method. The features include (i) *the service contents to be replayed are selected by the users*; and (ii) *the service providing device supplies a corresponding service contents to a system operating device in real time in response to a service content request from the system operating device inputted through the Internet.*

The Examiner stated that "Plotnick discloses ... a system comprising a plurality of digital set-top boxes of users for replaying service contents *selected by the user* in real time (page 10 paragraph (0146) line 7-10)."

Plotnick, however, discloses an alternative advertising in prerecorded media for presenting viewers with an alternative brief version of a recorded advertisement when the users choose to fast-forward through or skip the prerecorded advertisement in a Personal Video Recorder (PVR), a digital version of VCR. Since the contents in Plotnick's system are obtained by prerecording from a media including a television, and video server, and the like, the viewer does not have any option to choose one from many contents in real time. Plotnick's system provides an alternative advertisement only when the viewer wants to fast-forward or skip a part of the prerecorded contents such as the prerecorded advertisement. Once the viewer fast-forwards or skip the part, then the Plotnick's system provides with the alternative contents according to its own processing of the skipped parts, or targeted advertisements. The alternative contents are not selected by the viewer in any way. (See page 10, paragraph (0146) lines 7-10).

Plotnick's system uses a profiling module to analyze user actions and habits and infer demographic, psychographic, and behavioral characteristics of the viewing household and individual viewers, but it does not care or receive a selection from the viewer. (See page 10, paragraph (0146) lines 11-17).

In addition, the service providing device supplies a corresponding service contents to a system operating device in real time in response to a service content request from the system operating device inputted through the Internet. In page 3 paragraph (0064), however, Plotnick discloses that the contents may include other Internet based graphics or video, but not that the contents are obtained by a request inputted through the Internet.

Therefore, Plotnick does not anticipate all the elements and features of Claim 1 of the present invention. Withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2

The Examiner stated that "Plotnick discloses ... a media server (Video Server(422) in figure 5) for receiving the service contents supplied from the service providing device by connecting to the Internet through a cable or an optical cable and from temporally storing the same at the storing block and outputting the same (Figure 9)."

However, the Plotnick's video server (422) in figure 5 does not include any connections to receive the service contents from outside. (See Fig. 4) Plotnick's system is for the Personal Video Recorder (PVR). Thus, it does not provide more user controls other than the traditional controls including fast-forwards or rewinds.

Therefore, Plotnick does not anticipate all the elements and features of Claim 2. Withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

Although Applicant has not addressed all the issues of the dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant does not necessarily agree with the characterization and assessments of the dependent claims made by the Examiner, and Applicant believes that each claim is patentable on its own merits. Claims 2-9 and 11 are dependent either directly or indirectly on the above-discussed independent Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer and

include their own patentable features, and are therefore in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of all claim rejections and prompts allowance of the claims.

Therefore, Plotnick does not anticipate all the elements or features of the present invention. Withdrawal of the 102(b) rejections of Claims 1 through 11 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The applicant believes that the rejections were obviated by the amendment of claims, and the application is now in condition for allowance: therefore, reexamination, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectively requested. If there are any additional comments or requirements from the examination, the applicant asks for a non-final office action.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication, or credit any over-payment to Deposit Account No. 16-0310.

Very truly yours,

Park Law Firm

By: 

Choongseop Lee, Ph.D.

Regis. No. 57,051

Dated: 5/7, 2008

3255 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1110

Los Angeles, California 90010

Tel: (213) 389-3777